

FEB 28 2007

U.S.S.N. 10/040,773

9

PD-201122

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 14-20 are allowed. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of the rejections.

In the Office Action, only claims 1-13 and 21-23 stand rejected. Claims 14-20 stand allowed. Applicants note the application has claims 24 and 25 that have not been rejected. Applicants, therefore, believe claims 24 and 25 to be allowable since they have not been rejected.

Claims 1-13 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon (U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,618) in view of Ganesh (U.S. Pat. No. 7,065,082) and further in view of Ganesh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,031,297). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for filtering content. A filtering router shown in Figure 4 is used. The method steps are illustrated in Figure 7B and will be described below. Claim 1 recites receiving at a content filtering router a packet containing a request for content, where said packet comprises a first destination internet protocol (IP) address of a content server that stores the content and a second destination IP address of the content filtering router. The corresponding step is Step 734, which is described on Page 13, Lines 1-4.

Claim 1 further recites determining whether the first destination IP address is on a list of destination IP addresses to be filtered. This is illustrated in Figure 7B as Step 736 and is described on Page 14, Lines 10-12.

Claim 1 also recites routing the packet to an output port on the content filtering router based on the first destination IP address and the list. This is illustrated as Step 744 and is described on Page 14, Lines 15-16.

U.S.S.N. 10/040,773

10

PD-201122

The first step of claim 1 is receiving at a **content filtering router**. The last clause is routing the packet to an output port **Omni-content filtering router**. Thus, the claim is from the perspective of a content filtering router.

The Examiner generally rejects claim 1 using the Shannon reference, column 12, line 24, for a content routing filter. Applicant has reviewed the passages in and around column 12, line 24, and can find no teaching or suggestion of a content routing filter. The Shannon reference is generally directed to an access control of network data.

It should also be noted that claim 1 also recites that the packet comprises a first destination internet protocol address, a content server that stores said content and a second IP address of said content filtering router. The Examiner fails to even allege a packet having two addresses.

For the second clause, the Examiner points to column 6, line 13. Applicant has reviewed this passage which states:

"The network device 100 that either allows or denies the detected web page or information request based on an examination of the content of the specific request and compares them with access control data stored in databases 203, 204 and 208."

However, this passage does not teach a list of destination IP addresses to be filtered. Therefore, the Shannon reference also does not meet this clause.

The Examiner then states that the Shannon reference does not teach routing to an output port based on the IP address and list. Applicants agree. The Examiner then points to the Shabtay reference and the Ganesh reference in the alternative.

The Examiner states the use of a disc card port is taught in detailed description 41 of Shabtay. It is unclear to Applicant to what the "41" reference refers. It should be noted that the last clause of claim 1 recites routing the packet to an output port on the *content filtering router*

U.S.S.N. 10/040,773

11

PD-201122

based on the first destination IP address and the list. The Shabtay reference does not teach a content filtering router and, thus, does not teach routing the packet to an output port on the content filtering router. Therefore, the Shabtay reference does not teach or suggest this element.

The Examiner also points to the Ganesh reference for discarded ports. However, the Ganesh reference does not teach a packet comprising a first destination internet protocol address of a content server that stores the content and a second IP address of a content filtering router. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion for routing the packet to an output port on the content filtering router based on the first destination IP address and the list. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of this rejection.

Likewise, claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 21 is similar to claim 1 in that communication procedures are set forth that are configured to receive a packet that also includes a first destination IP address and a second destination IP address. A routing protocol is set forth having several instructions for determining whether the first IP address is on a list, instructions for routing the packet to one of the output ports based on the first destination IP address on the list, and a routing table containing the list. This claim is similar to claim 1 and, therefore, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 22 is an independent claim that adds a second destination IP address similar to that of claim 14. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 14 was allowable.

Claim 23 recites instructions for adding a second IP address of a content filtering router to the packet. This claim is also similar to claim 14 and Applicants respectfully submit that this claim should also be allowable for the same reasons as claim 14 was allowable.

FEB 28 2007

U.S.S.N. 10/040,773

12

PD-201122

CONCLUSION

In light of the remarks above, Applicants submit that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Should any fees be associated with this submission, please charge Deposit Account 50-0383.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 28, 2007

By: Georgann S. Grunebach, Reg. No. 33,179  
Attorney for Applicants

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.  
CA/LA1/A109  
2230 East Imperial Highway  
P.O. Box 956  
El Segundo, CA 90245  
Telephone: (310) 964-4615